

in the United States for the last 18 years. It is in decline. What do we replace it with? More imported oil? Export more jobs? And \$57 billion dollars is the cost of imported oil. We have an opportunity, and the opportunity is now because this issue is in the reconciliation package.

There has been tremendous pressure on the White House on this issue. But not once has the White House addressed the national security interests. What has happened in the Mideast, Mr. President? What has happened with Libya, our friend Qadhafi? We all know Saddam Hussein, Iraq, and what is going on in Iran today, and the threat against Israel's national security. The Mideast is going to have a crisis. It is just a matter of time. We have heard from a number of statesmen. Larry Eagleburger, former Secretary of State, Schlesinger—many, many others saying do not put your eggs in one basket. That Middle East situation is going to explode, and our increased dependence on that market is going to result in the United States being held hostage because of our increased dependency on imported oil.

Mr. President, this would be the largest single job producer in North America. It would not cost the Federal Government 1 cent. There is no subsidy. There is no appropriation. The private sector will bid this in at an estimated bidding price to the Federal Government, the State of Alaska, at \$2.6 billion.

In addition, there is approximately \$80 million or more that is anticipated as a revenue stream to be contributed to refuge maintenance in our national parks and refuges. And as a consequence of the increased need for these facilities, I would like to do see more funding put in for our parks and other areas.

I appreciate the extension of time. Let me just make a couple of more points because I do not see other Members who wish to speak at this time.

There is some suggestion that this is going to have an effect on the polar bear. Anyone in Alaska can tell you the polar bear do not den in ANWR. They do not on land. They den at sea on the Arctic ice. You talk about the polar bear. We do not allow the polar bear to be hunted by Caucasians. You cannot take a polar bear in Alaska unless you are a Native. You can only take it for subsistence. You cannot take a hunter out for hire. In Canada, you can take a \$10,000 bill, and you can go out and shoot a polar bear; anybody.

So we are taking care of our polar bear. We are taking care of our renewable resources.

So the environmental community is selling America short on our technology. And I would look forward to an extended debate on the factual realities associated with this issue because what we have seen is rhetoric, rhetoric, rhetoric, rhetoric, rhetoric; no factual information of any kind.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would be happy to yield for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague from Alaska.

I wanted to ask the Senator. In the committee I had an amendment which said that if we go forward with oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge there ought to be at least an environmental impact statement that is filed. Can the Senator explain why he disagrees with that? I know in fact we have not had one since 1987. Much has changed since then, and the Secretary stated that an environmental impact statement will be necessary for each new lease sale. This is certainly a new lease sale. Even if you are for drilling in ANWR, I think there is a big argument against it. It is not rhetoric. Why will the Senator at least not be willing to go forward with environmental impact statement?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, there are different views. The Senator is coming from the point of view of an obstructionist. We had an environmental impact statement prepared for the first lease sale. The application of updating that is certainly appropriate. But to suggest we have to go back and start the process over means you are simply putting it off, and as a consequence we will simply import more oil from overseas.

So this is just another obstructionist proposal because we have already had an adequate EIS. If you are going to bury this thing, then you have to take the responsibility for it.

The Senator from Alaska simply is fed up with these arguments that have no foundation. They are simply obstructionist views, and as a consequence it is not relevant.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair, and wish the President a good day.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, time is set aside for Mr. HATCH to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder whether the Senator from Utah would be willing to give me 2 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I need the full 15 minutes.

I will be happy to yield 1 minute. I yield a minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from Alaska that I would have been pleased to go on with this debate. I think the national environmental law requires an environmental impact statement. It is not obstructionism to say so. I think for the vast majority of the people in the country, First, they do not believe on environmental

grounds, or on energy grounds, that we need to do oil drilling which could threaten the pristine wilderness area, a real treasure for this Nation; and, Second, I think people believe, if you are going to go forward with it, you at least ought to be willing to file an environmental impact statement so we can know what in the world it is going to do. We had the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. A lot has happened since 1987. That is not, I say to my colleague, obstructionism for me to come to the floor and to make that clear.

I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the environmental impact statement was completed in 1987, and it took 5 years to complete. There were full public hearings and extensive studies. The record speaks for itself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. This would have been an interesting debate for me too. I have to say that with the debate around here this has been studied, and it has been unbelievable. We had all the same bizarre and extreme claims with regard to the caribou up there, and now we have more caribou and more wildlife than ever before. Alaska is just such a vast place. Maybe it is time we started thinking about the country, and about how we can stay independent and have national security.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I think my colleague should give me a minute to respond.

Mr. HATCH. I would like to finish my other statement. I would like to shift. I just had to make that comment because I hear this all the time, and I get kind of tired of it.

DRUG SENTENCING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the past month there has been much discussion about penalties for crack cocaine and about whether we should lower them. Of course, on Tuesday, President Clinton signed legislation preventing reduced sentences for crack cocaine from taking effect. That was the responsible course of action to take, and he should be commended for taking it.

So I was disturbed to read, in Saturday's New York Times that:

*** in Miami, some Federal prosecutors say they have chosen not to charge some crack suspects because they believe the punishment they will face is unduly harsh. [NY Times, October 28, 1995]

I am sure most Senators will agree that those who violate the law must be vigorously prosecuted. Congress enacts the laws and penalties, and the Justice Department enforces them. I have written to the Attorney General asking whether there is any evidence that crack prosecutions—or any other type of prosecutions—are being foregone because Federal prosecutors feel the penalties are too harsh.

The Times's unattributed statement is also troubling in light of the fact

that Federal drug prosecutions have slipped more than 12 percent since 1992—from 25,033 in 1992 to 21,905 in 1995.

I want to take a couple of minutes to reinforce the reasons why this body voted unanimously to block reductions in crack sentences, especially since the Washington Post has been attacking President Clinton for signing the legislation [President Clinton and Crack, November 2, 1995].

Some basics: penalties for crack are currently two to six times higher than for a comparable quantity of powder cocaine—not 100 times longer as some have imagined.

Crack use is associated with the explosion in the most horrifying cases of child abuse in recent years. And while drug addiction has long been a path to prostitution, crack has created what on the street is called the “freak house” phenomenon, where female crack addicts gather to trade sex for their next \$5 piece of crack.

Crack dealers are notorious for their remorseless killings.

Crack is a much more powerful psychoactive agent than powder cocaine.

According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, the typical dealer is caught selling 109 grams of crack—the equivalent of 3,000 rocks.

The Sentencing Commission tells us that crack defendants are more likely to have carried a weapon than other traffickers, and are more likely to have had an extensive criminal record at the time of arrest.

No one, to my knowledge, disputes these basic facts. No one claims that those who are convicted are innocent.

It is true that some low-level crack dealers are being arrested. Yet, very few Federal crack defendants are low-level, youthful, and nonviolent. According to the U.S. Sentencing Commission, of the 3,430 crack defendants convicted in 1994, there were just 51 youthful, small-time crack offenders with no prior criminal history and no weapons involvement.

In other words, despite all the rhetoric, just 1 crack defendant out of 67 qualifies as youthful, nonviolent, and low-level. Incidentally, under the so-called safety valve provision of last year's Crime Act, cases similar to the 51 are now eligible for specially lenient sentences.

We have a situation where, unfortunately, opponents of the sentencing regime are dismissing the facts. That is regrettable, especially so since the victims of the crack trade are so overwhelmingly concentrated among the minority residents of our inner cities.

For a blunt assessment of crack's effects in the inner city, listen to T. Willard Fair, president and CEO of the Urban League of Greater Miami:

[Crack dealers] sell death to my community. They undermine the peace and harmony of my community by virtue of what they choose to do.

Crack is not the only problem we are facing, of course. Today, a major

national survey is being released by PRIDE—a parents' group headquartered in Atlanta. PRIDE has found dramatic increases in drug use among kids. Cocaine is up. Hallucinogens are up.

Marijuana use is up 111 percent in grades 6-8. It is up 67 percent in grades 9-12. One in three high school seniors now smokes marijuana. This confirms reporting from other sources that in 1994, the number of high-school kids smoking pot hit 2.9 million—nearly 1.3 million more than in 1992.

This chart shows the fruits of our newly permissive attitude toward drugs. Among 9-12th graders, marijuana use is up for the 3d straight year, from 16.4 percent of students back in the 1991-92 school year to 28.2 percent of students.

Like many of my colleagues, I am also concerned at the Clinton administration's misguided policy of focusing on hard-core drug addicts—people who are very difficult to rehabilitate.

I am not saying we should not, but our limited funds ought to be going to these first-time youthful offenders that we have a chance of rehabilitating, not for people who we have virtually no chance of rehabilitating.

One key indicator of the success or failure of such a policy is the number of emergency room admissions, because many emergency room cases involve addicts and burned-out users. There is a survey instrument that studies such cases, and many Members of Congress will have heard of it—the Drug Abuse Warning Network, better known as DAWN.

Members may be surprised to learn that the numbers for DAWN have been unaccountably late this year. That is right: The numbers for the first half of 1994, which should have been released months ago, are now sixteen months old.

In past years, these numbers have always been released in April. The 1993 numbers were released on April 11, 1994. The 1992 numbers were released on April 23, 1993. The 1991 numbers were released on December 18 of the same year—less than 5 months after the survey data had been collected.

It is my understanding that the administration had planned to finally release this data on Friday. It is further my understanding that the data will show a large upswing in the use of cocaine and methamphetamine.

Unfortunately, the American people will have to wait a few more days for this information. You see, the administration has postponed the release of this data until next Tuesday, which just so happens to be the day elections are being held in Virginia, New Jersey, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In other words, to get past the election, or at least that is what it appears to be.

Voters in these states will not learn of this evidence of failed leadership until after election day. What does this tell the American people about the Clinton Administration's drug policy?

And why do we have to wait 16 months for this information when we know from past experience that we can get it in less than 5? It is intolerable that the Congress has to wait over a year for vital information on the present state of our drug problem.

The administration is aware of the seriousness of this problem. According to the Attorney General:

The latest surveys confirm that despite some recent gains, drug use in the United States is clearly on the upswing once again. The social consequences—of drug use—cannot be reduced or affected by enforcement efforts until our society changes its more tolerant attitude toward drugs. . . .

Mr. President, the Attorney General called it exactly right. We are not going to get anywhere on this problem until we start to change attitudes again. The job of changing attitudes belongs to all of us in positions of national leadership. It also belongs to the President.

I have previously indicated that I think President Clinton is AWOL—absent without leadership—in the war on drugs. Senator DOLE and Senator GRASSLEY have already been vocal on this issue, on the need to bring national attention to bear on just how bad the situation has become. We need to revitalize the drug war. In coming months, I will be calling on a number of my colleagues to join in this effort.

I am concerned. By working together, I believe we can reclaim this lost ground. Just look at this chart, “Rate of Youthful Marijuana Use.” And we all know that once they start using marijuana, many of them will start trying harder drugs like cocaine, ultimately heroin, and so on. In grades 9 through 12, the PRIDE survey shows that we had a low here at 16.4 percent in 1991 and 1992, and from that day on it has gone up to where it is 28.2 percent.

Keep in mind, almost all these kids, a high percentage of these kids are going to try harder drugs because they think it is a fun thing to do after trying marijuana. Marijuana use is up, and it means the other harder drug usage will be up as well.

I wonder what this particular DAWN survey will say, but we will not have the privilege of knowing it until after the election this year.

We have a number of very important elections coming on that Tuesday.

No matter which way you look at it, you have to be alarmed by this problem of more and more kids grades 9 to 12 using marijuana every year since 1992.

Frankly, there is not much leadership in trying to stop them from doing so. Mr. President, I am concerned about these problems. I hope the administration is concerned. It is about time that they get concerned about these problems. We have to do what is right here. We have to do what is right, and do what is in the best interests of our kids and of our grandchildren and the future of our country. We have to start getting very, very tough on drug use in this country.

And for us and this administration to take the limited funds that are available, and use them for hard-core drug addicts, instead of these kids that need the help now that have a chance of being rehabilitated, I think, is basically immoral. If we have enough money left over, sure, I am willing to throw it down the drain by trying to help the hard-core drug addicts as well. And occasionally you will get one that will do a little bit better in treatment, but it is almost none who come through that process who are hard-core drug addicts. It is very, very uphill.

Frankly, with the limited funds we have, we ought to be using them to help those kids who need it and are likely to quit using drugs after the rehabilitation period starts.

Mr. President, I hope that the President and others will do more about this issue. We have all got to do more about this issue, and I am going to continue to speak out until I see some changes in this administration and some changes in our government as a whole. I hope that we will all cooperate in trying to do this because this is not a Republican/Democrat thing and not a pro-administration, anti-administration thing.

These are facts that have to be brought out. Hopefully the administration just does not understand, and once they do, will start doing more about it. And hopefully the President will use his bully pulpit to start fighting these things that are destroying America, financing crime and murders throughout this society, and killing our kids and their futures well into the future.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes under the previous order.

(The remarks of Mr. McCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1378 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to call the Senate's attention to a report that was released yesterday by the Council of Economic Advisors. The report is entitled, "Supporting Research and Development to Promote Economic Growth: The Federal Government's Role."

This report eloquently makes the case for the enormous positive impact

which Federal investments and research and development have in promoting economic growth and providing greater opportunities for our children and for future generations. Most of the debate we have had, Mr. President, about this budget this year has focused on whether particular cuts or reductions or particular tax increases have been fair to one group or another in our country. For example, are the Medicaid cuts too deep? Are the Medicare cuts too deep? Should we be putting an additional financial burden on students in schools? Should Congress be scaling back the earned-income tax credit on low- and moderate-income families while cutting taxes for those who are better off?

But another important part of the debate, the budget debate, needs to be about the impact of what is proposed in this budget on the long-term economic growth of the country. And that is the issue that I would like to focus on here this morning.

The report that was released yesterday by the Council of Economic Advisors makes several crucial points that the congressional majority needs to understand as it embarks on what I see as a disastrous course of slashing Federal civilian research investments by the year 2002. Let me just read a couple sentences from the report.

It says:

Increasing the productivity of the American workforce is the key to higher living standards and stronger economic growth in the future. Evidence indicates that investments in research and development have large payoffs in terms of growth. . . . Indeed, investments in research and development—are estimated to account for half or more of the increase in output per person. Maintaining or increasing this country's research and development effort is essential if we are to increase the rate of productivity growth and improve American living standards.

The report finds that "many studies have demonstrated that investments in research and development yield high returns to investors and even higher returns to society." The report points out that it is this difference between the returns capturable by a single firm or an individual and the returns to the society as a whole that leads the private sector to underinvest in research and creates the need for public investment in research and development.

Mr. President, this is a need that has been recognized throughout this Nation's history, going back to the first Treasury Secretary of this country, Alexander Hamilton. The report points to the \$30,000 that was appropriated in 1842 to build a telegraph between Washington, DC, and Baltimore, to demonstrate the feasibility of Samuel Morse's new technology.

It points to the 1862 Morrill Act, and that is an act, of course, that has benefited each of our States—Government funding of agricultural research. It points to the enormous benefits that have flowed from the expansion of Federal research investments following

World War II pursuant to the vision that Vannevar Bush described in his report "Science: The Endless Frontier," which was submitted to President Truman in June 1945 at the end of the war.

Yet, there are some very disturbing charts in this report. The first of these charts I want to refer my colleagues to is a chart of nondefense research and development expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product. What you can see here is that the United States has been lagging behind Japan and Germany in its nondefense research expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product for more than two decades.

The yellow line is the United States. Japan is now substantially above both the United States and Germany in its investment in research and development, nondefense research and development, as a percentage of its gross domestic product.

This second chart indicates Federal investments, U.S. investments in nondefense research and development and shows very clearly that they have been declining substantially since the 1960's as a percentage of gross domestic product. You can see from the period 1961 to 1996, there was a short period there in the early sixties where there was a substantial increase during the heyday of the space program. It began to come down. It has continued its downward trend, as a general matter, until today, and it is scheduled in this proposed GOP budget for a substantial additional decline in the next several years. That Federal research investment, as this chart shows, will plummet during the next several years.

As the report that was issued yesterday points out, this is a greatly different plan of action from what governments in other parts of the world are doing, particularly Japan and Germany, who are our main rivals economically and technologically. Those countries around the world are seeking to follow the example of the United States, to emulate the successful American model of the last century, just at the same time that we, as a nation, seem bent on abandoning that model or wrecking it. The Council of Economic Advisers' report points out that the Japanese Government recently announced its plans to double its research and development spending by the year 2000.

We have a chart here that I think is a very important chart for people to focus on. This highlights the effect of our congressional budget plan and the effect of the Japanese plan. What you can see is that by the year 1997, Japan will overtake the United States in Government support for nondefense research and development, and that is not as a percentage of our gross domestic product, that is in absolute dollars. You can see that by 1997, the Japanese will be spending more than we will if we stay on the course that has been